

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF INCIVILITY ON TOLERANCE LEVEL IN LARGE TEXTILE UNITS OF FAISALABAD, PAKISTAN

**Mudassar Mushtaq, Ghulam Abid, Dr. Babak Mahmood*

Abstract

The study was carried out to check the prevalence level of civility in textile based business organizations of Faisalabad. The prime objective of the study is to examine the level of tolerance by the personnel working on different aspects of incivility along with brief exploration of personal experience of incivility. For this purpose, five large textile organizations were selected randomly, 25 respondents were chosen from each organization conveniently by maintaining one condition that respondents must represent different levels and departments. Questionnaire was used as a tool to collect data. Certain statistical techniques applied to get the meaning out of the data. Results revealed that majority of the respondents have experienced some sort of incivility at one or the other place. The respondents showed some good deal of tolerance towards incivility that is perhaps due to socioeconomics milieu of Pakistan.

Key Terms: Incivility, tolerance, human resource, human behavior

Introduction

In/civility is a global issue (Vickers, 2006) and its significance multiplies when one talks about workplace where one spends maximum prime time (Rice-Oxley, M. 2006). Although workplace incivility has been considered a big threat to human resource development and practices but even very little work has been done on this momentous issue so far in a developing country like Pakistan where during employment people have to face a lot of incivility (Pearson & Porath, 2009).

Civility in common words is a respectful treatment of others (Tyler & Blader, 2000). It does work in society as glue to make effective synergies that further establish many avenues of development. Positively, civility comprises respect, consideration, comparison, care and positive interaction (Spreitzer, 1995). While on negative side it can be inferred just the opposite: rebuke, negligence, rough, and negative interaction for only vested interests. In the words of Porath (2011), "they are not mere opposition; ... by removing incivility, one does not necessarily feel civility: something more is required. Yet so many civil interactions require so little effort. Little niceties, attention, body language, tone,

** Ph. D Scholar National College of Business Administration, Lahore
National College of Business Administration, Lahore
Associate Prof. of Sociology, Government College University Faisalabad*

response, and gestures can make all the difference between what is perceived as civil or uncivil”. However, one cannot demarcate a line between civil or uncivil because a slight switch in just ordinary things can make a difference. This alone suffices to prove the delicacy of the problem statement.

Things become more complex when economy is developing, jobs are not available so easily. Masculinity and hegemony (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005) have already established that made incivility not only acceptable but mandatory for an effective management. Although it is presumed that the organizations running international business are more refined in their manners (Mahmood, 2009), the current study is a need of time that will check the current situation of civility in large scale business organization of Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan. The study aims to meet the following objectives:

- i- To find if respondents face incivility in their everyday routines at work place.
- ii- To explore aspects or dimensions of incivility.
- iii- To assess the level of tolerance of the respondents towards uncivil conduct.

The study is based on the assumption that people are facing some uncivil practices in their respective organizations. It has the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. The higher the age of the client, the lower will be the tolerance towards organizational incivility.

Hypothesis 2. Personal experience of incivility lowers tolerance level.

Review of Literature

Civility has many dimensions; more significant and widely studied are cooperation, conduct, courteousness, kindness and spirit of living together (Forni, 2002). The concept also involves a complete ‘awareness’ relating to family: family includes both ‘family at-house’ and ‘family at workplace’. Forni (2002) further extends the concept as activeness for the well-being of community. Civility coins up as a positive kick-off towards many emotional benefits that can make physiological and psychological cronies healthier (Pearson and Porath, 2009). The logical result of all this is nothing except earning a high level of ‘trust’

everywhere. Trust is an integral part to establish a productive organization as well as prosperous society (Fokoyuma, 2000). This trust makes people and organizations more productive (Spretzer, 1995; Porath, Spreitzer and Gibson, 2008). The current study aims at looking at very ground level of the whole phenomenon. Two basic indicators, personal experiences and prevailing aspects of civility with reference to tolerance level of the people working in large textile organizations shall be studied here.

Personal experience needs to be seen mainly because tendency of incivility creates stress, fatigue, and other related psychological traumas (Hallowell, 1997) that directly affect creativity, concentration, and motivation. Prevalence of uncivil practices in an organization may make one not only low productive but also an agent of further destruction. According to a research conducted by Lazarus and Fohzman (1984), ordinary daily incivilities often result in major psychological upsets. They further extrapolate that in many cases, even more indirect and covert incivilities result in more severe emotional scars than overt incivilities. The current study explores the possible prevalence of incivility along with its intensity. The pattern of this paper is designed to further check the assumptions of Porath (2011) that one-time or several times, low or high level incivility may have different effects on the respondents. For this, personal experiences of the respondents need to be explored.

Organizations working in different cultures may have different aspects of incivility. A good tool to check the prevalence and different dimensions of incivility is to study the 'existence of teams' as both are inversely proportionate to each other (Porath, 2010). The most significant effect of civility is the sense of emotional safety in an organization (Edmondson, 1999). All will feel more comfortable with each other and it will push the concept of honesty that is mandatory for any organizational growth. Keeping in view all this theoretical framework, the respondents have been questioned on several dimensions of workplace incivility like disrespectfulness, distrust (Gittel, 2003), quarrelsomeness, blaming (Mayer, 2006), favoritism, professional exclusion (Gill and Sypher, 2009). Hence, the current research is to enhance the productivity of organizations by keeping their human resource cared properly.

Tolerance is a complex phenomenon due to its variability in different societies and organization (Miner et al., 2012). It also varies from person to person. But tolerance becomes an important variable as it is the most vital indicator that reflects the real state of incivility with true intensity (Miner et al., 2012). Lowering the tolerance level due to incivility will surely witness bad name to the organization concerned (Porath et al., 2010). Porath (2011) concluded that it pays if your employees treat one another with respect because there is association between positive feelings and high level of performance.

Methodology

Faisalabad's large textile based organizations have been selected as universe. Faisalabad is third largest city of Pakistan and second in exports. List of such organizations was picked from Faisalabad chamber of commerce and randomly five organizations were selected after getting formal permission from each organization selected: Masood Textile Mills, Kalash Textiles, Crescent Textile Mills Limited, Interloop Limited and J.K. Spinning Mills Limited. It was taken care that these respondents must be from different department and of different cadres. For this purpose convenient sampling method was used because of very busy schedule of the respondents. A well-structured questionnaire, comprising of close-end questions was constructed to collect the data. Three prime variables (as discussed under review of literature) operationalized that are personal experiences, aspects of incivility and tolerance level of the respondents. Certain statistical techniques applied to check central tendencies and dispersion were mean and standard deviation. While cross-tab along with Chi square applied to check the magnitude and direction of relationship between the variables that are hypothesized.

Result and Discussion

Before transferring the raw data into some meaningful manner, it sounds logical to check the reliability of the responses. If the responses lack in their consistency then drawing true results in more cosmetics (Neuman, 2000). For this purpose Cronbach alpha was applied on three main variables and all shown good reliability.

Sr.No.	Variable	No. of Items	Probability (cronback alpha)
--------	----------	--------------	------------------------------

1	Aspects of incivility	19	.865(87%)
2	Personal Experience	8	.82(82%)
3	Tolerance	10	.723(72%)

All the results are up to the mark showing more than 70% consistency in responses that is highly acceptable in social sciences (Neuman, 2000).

1. Various aspects of workplace incivility

	Mean	Std. Deviation
It's easy for me to become upset by bad behavior at work	2.30	.927
I become stressed when i experience bad behavior at work.	2.36	.937
I become stressed when I observe bad behavior at work	2.2320	.84
My understanding of bad workplace behavior is the same as most other colleagues.	2.4640	.90
My tolerance for bad behavior at work is the same as most other colleagues	2.3040	.87
It's easy for me to become excited by positive behavior at work.	2.0565	.88
I am more creative when I work in a positive environment.	1.9200	.85
I am more engaged when I observe positive behavior at work	2.0080	.85

My understanding of positive behavior is the same as most others.	2.0960	.71
My desire for positive behavior at work is the same as most others.	2.3040	.89
Valid N (list wise)		

When respondents were asked about various aspects of incivility, majority responses against different indicators on the Likert scale were recorded as above. Interestingly mean response is lying between agreed and neutral. This may be due to the political environment that mostly hinders the respondents to share their voice of heart. In addition, standard deviation does also support this idea. However, the results show that most of the organizational practices are being carried out in civic manner but the respondents are conscious about incivility. It also has established that these organizations are trying to carry their routine work in a civic manner but it is likely that many incivilities take place. This argument has also got approval by the following table.

1. Personal Experience

	Mean	Std. Deviation
in my work life	2.0806	.7
in my current position.	2.3360	.93
in current organization in the past year.	2.5200	.96
in current organization in the past six months.	2.4720	.99
in my current organization in the past month.	2.4480	.99
in my current organization in the past week	2.6240	.98
Towards others at my workplace and work-life:	2.2720	.96
In my work-life/professional life	2.2880	.84

Valid N (listwise)		
--------------------	--	--

The respondents mostly have shown their agreement that once (at least) they observed incivility in their respective organizations. In response to various indicators of incivility the majority responded as agreed. The questions were established in order to check systematically the frequency of such occurrences that may prove as uncivil. The responses have established that majority of the respondents frequently face incivility in their respective organizations. The deviations of the responses are found almost same that also strengthen the argument.

Hypothesis 1: The higher the age, the lower will be the tolerance towards organizational incivility.

Although the responses on age are revealing normal distribution as given below (Table 3) but due to less number of the respondents, the age variable is computed on SPSS and transformed into the other variables by keeping the same code; new categories are computed as:

Categories	Age Brackets	Frequency
1	18-30	38
2	31-40	50
3	41 and above	37

Tolerance Level

Age Categories	Large	Medium	Low	Total
18-30	10	17	11	38
	12	20	18	50
31-40	12	13	12	37
	34	50	41	
41-50				
Total				

Chi-Square 11.375

Correlation -0.96

Gamma 0.152

df 4

Significance .000

The cross table between Age and tolerance level of the respondents towards incivility shows that maximum as age is increasing, the tolerance level of the respondents is decreasing. Maximum level of tolerance is among the respondents aged between 31-40 and as they shift into next category their tolerance level decreases. This may be due to the factor that personal may think that at the beginning of their careers it is not customary to retaliate against any incivility. It is possible because of local culture that makes people more submissive and they consider submission part of their professional development (Mahmood, 2009). Certain chi-Square tests also applied to check significance of the relationship and results reveal that the hypothesis that tolerance level decreases as age increase has been accepted. In order to check the strength of relationship between the variables – age and tolerance level – correlation was tested and its result 0.96 verified the strong relationship. However, the direction of the relationship is negative that proves that both the variables have inverse relationship; hence age increases and the tolerance level decreases. This is the same that also proved by Gamma value that is 0.152. the results of correlation also strengthen the decision about the acceptance of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2. The higher the prevalence of incivility, the higher will be the tolerance.

Prevalence of incivility	Tolerance Level			Total
	Large	Medium	Low	
Low	12	24	4	40
Medium	13	33	17	63
High	5	7	8	20
Total	30	64	29	

Chi-Square 19.222

Correlation 0.83

Gamma 0.116

df 4

Significance .000

It was also hypothesized that there is an association between prevalence of incivility and tolerance level. The logic was quite simple: where incivility is in practice people also have developed tolerance for

that. Firstly, both the variables were cross-tabulated and the result proved the same. As prevalence of incivility is shifting from low to high, the tolerance level is also increasing. It is referring to the study of Anderson and Pearson (1999) who found the human nature flexible. They argued that tolerance does not only create a mechanism of resistance but also makes people tolerant about many elements. Pearson's chi-square had proved the significance of the relationship. Hence, that hypothesis has been accepted. To verify the magnitude and direction of the relationship between the two variables, correlation was applied. The results showed that both the variables have a strong positive relationship: increase in one variable affects the other positively. In order to see the combined effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable, a regression model was also developed to determine the degree of change being caused in the dependent variable due to the predicting factors and such findings help policy makers and decision makers to manipulate and control the criterion variable.

MODEL

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	df1	Significance
	.410 ^a	.668	.654	.54435	.568	2	.000

ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	7.107	2	3.553	11.991	.000 ^b
Residual	35.262	119	.296		
Total	42.369	121			

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.872	.196		4.446	.000
Age	-.035	.081	-.038	-.436	
Prevalence of Incivility	.362	.075	.417	4.841	

The model reveals that 67% of the change in the dependent variable that is tolerance level is being caused by two factors that are age and prevalence of incivility. In management sciences such an R square value is considerable and can help policy makers make the environment more civil and less hostile. ANOVA shows the significance of regression that proves the viability of the model.

Conclusion

Incivility at workplace has manifold impacts on workers on productivity, health, attitudes, and relationships. Although the impact of incivility can be found on finance, environment, structure, and administration but the foremost issue is to check if it exists or not and if it does exist then what are its possible shapes and dimensions. And above all how people endure it or what is their tolerance level. In highly masculine societies like the one that is under study such incivilities are quite common but the organizations running their business with the organizations of developed countries are being expected to have some more civility in their organizations or at least they are supposed to have some good understanding of the concept. This paper adds value to the knowledge of incivility by categorizing variables to show the prevalence of incivility, aspects of incivility and tolerance level of the people towards incivility. The study also undertakes the concept of age and specially its relationship with tolerance level. The study proved that incivility exists even in the large business organizations and people mentioned different

dimensions of it. This study can be used in a wide variety of other workplace settings and can be expanded to other faculties like judiciary, hospitals and educational institutions.

References

- Andersson, L.M., & Pearson, C.M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of management review*, 24, 452-471.
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. In *Administrative science Quarterly*, 44, 350-383.
- Forni, P.M (2002). *Choosing civility: The twenty-five rules of considerate conduct*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Gibson, C.B., & Dibble, R.(2008). Culture inside and out: Developing the collective capability to externally adjust. In S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Advances in cultural intelligence* (PP. 221-240). New York: Shape.
- Gill, M.J., & Sypher, B.D. (2009). Workplace incivility and trust. In P. Lutgen-Sandvik, & B.D. Sypher (Eds), *Destructive organizational communication: Processes, Consequences, and constructive ways of organizing* (PP. 53-73). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gittell, J.H. (2003). *The Southwest Airlines way: Using the power of relationships to achieve high-performance*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hallowell, E.M. (1999). *Connect: 12 vital ties that open your heart, lengthen your life, and deepen your soul*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Hallowell, E.M. (1997). *Worry*. New York: Random House.
- Hofstede, G. & Hofstede, G.J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw.
- Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). *An integration model of organizational trust*. *Academy of management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.
- Mahmood, Babak. (2009). *Sociological study of behavioral change in textile manufacturing organizations of Punjab, Pakistan, in the context of global business culture*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Agriculture.
- Meyer, D. (2006). *Setting the table: The transforming power of hospitality in business*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Pearson. C.M., & Porath, C.L. (2009). *The cost of bad behavior-how incivility damages your business and what you can do about it*. New York: Portfolio Penguin Group (USA) Inc.
- Porath, C. L. (2010). *The health effects of incivility*. Working paper, Georgetown University. Washington. DC.
- Porath, C L., & Erez, A. (2009). Overlooked but not untouched: How incivility reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks. In *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109, 29-44.
- Porath, C.L & Erez, A. (2007). *Does rudeness matter? The effects of rude behavior on task performance and helpfulness*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1181-1197.
- Porath, C.L., MacInnis, & Folkes, V.S. (2010a). Witnessing incivility among employees: Effects on consumer anger and negative inferences about companies. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 292-303.
- Porath C.L., MacInnis D., & Folkes V. (In Press). *It's unfair: Why customers who merely observe an uncivil employee abandon the company*. *Journal of Services Research*.

- Porath, C.L., MacInnis, D., & Folkes, V. (2010c). Witnessing uncivil interactions between employees: Effects on consumer behavior. Working paper, Georgetown University, Washington, DC.
- Porath, C.L., Shapiro, D.L., & Duffy, M.K. (2004, August). When does perceived incivility lead to production deviance? A test of a systemwide perspective? Paper presented at the annual Academy of Management meeting, New Orleans, LA.
- Porath, C.L., Spreitzer, G., & Gibson, C. (2008, August). Antecedents and consequences of thriving across six organizations. Paper presented at the annual Academy of Management meeting, Anaheim, CA.
- Rice-Oxley, M. (2006, January 23). R-e-s-p-e-c-t, find out what it means to England. The Christian Science Monitor. Retrieved from thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-24/edition-7/how-rudeness-takes-its-toll
- Spreitzer, G.M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
- Tyler, T.R., & Blader, S.L. (2000). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity and behavior engagement*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Vickers, M.H. (2006). Writing what's relevant: Workplace incivility in public administration - A Wolf in sheep's clothing. *Administrative theory & praxis*, 28(1), 69-88.